

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C., UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

JAN 09 2008

In re Application of:

Application No. : 10/782,471 Confirmation No. : 4908
Applicant(s) : Michaels, et al.
Filing Date : 19 February 2004

Entitled : METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR THE DISPOSAL OF
WASTE FLUID

Group Art Unit : 3753
Examiner : RIVELL, John A.
Docket No. : MV-6177/6206

**VIA FACSIMILE 571.273.8300
NO CONFIRMATION FOLLOWS**

Commissioner for Patents
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Post Office Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and accurate copy of the within document, together with all attachments referred to herein, is being transmitted to the Honorable Commissioner for Patents, either by first-class mail, postage prepaid, addressed to Commissioner for Patents, Post Office Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, or by facsimile transmission to the facsimile number indicated hereon, on this the 9th day of January, 2008.

Kimberly C. Luna
Kimberly C. Luna

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Sir:

Applicants respectfully submit this response to the Restriction Requirement mailed on 16 November 2007 in which claims 1-27 were subject to restriction. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. A Petition for a One-Month Extension of Time, Form PTO/SB/22, is enclosed herewith.

In the Restriction Requirement, the Examiner alleges that the following two patentably distinct inventions were claimed:

Group I (claims 1-7 and 14-27), drawn to a fluid transport device including a valved coupling containing flow paths for fluids into and out of a container and the associated "educator" mechanism; and,

Group II (claims 8-13), drawn to a coupling half, including parallel fluid paths.

Accordingly, Applicants make the following election, based on the assumption that Group I is drawn to the alleged invention recited in claims 1-7 and 14-27 and that Group II is drawn to the alleged invention recited in claims 8-13.